

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

|            |   |                         |   |              |
|------------|---|-------------------------|---|--------------|
| Applicant  | : | Eric Allan Bier         | ) | Examiner:    |
|            |   |                         | ) | Quoc A. Tran |
| Serial No. | : | 09/731,912              | ) |              |
|            |   |                         | ) | Art Unit:    |
| Cnfrm. No. | : | 1180                    | ) | 2176         |
|            |   |                         | ) |              |
| Filed      | : | December 8, 2000        | ) |              |
|            |   |                         | ) |              |
| For        | : | SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR | ) |              |
|            |   | EDITING A WEB PAGE      | ) |              |
|            |   |                         | ) |              |

---

**REPLY BRIEF PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 41.41**

**Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS**

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellant respectfully submits this reply brief in response to the Examiner's Answer, mailed on October 26, 2006.

**Supplemental Arguments**

In the Response to Argument (Section 10 of the Examiner's Answer, starting at the bottom of page 12), several newly presented points were raised and are now addressed.

Starting with section "A-1," the Examiner alleges, "Chang discloses in the Abstract and Figs 1-2 of pages 3-4 that a sparrow "to-do list" web page (electronic document) includes black triangle link which causes the item to "open" into a dialog-box-like region or editable item (template information or formatting information)" (emphasis added) (page 13, lines 6-9). Thus, in addition to the completely unsubstantiated assertion that editable formatting information would have been an "obvious variant" (see, the Answer, page 4, lines 9-13), the Examiner now equates the term "item," as described in the Chang document, with the claimed terms "template information" or "formatting information." It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have considered the Examiner's new interpretation of Chang reasonable, for the following reasons:

Contrary to the allegations presented in section “A-1,” an “item” in Chang is not “template information.” Rather, an “item” is a single contribution, formatted according to rules in a template (e.g., see Appellant’s specification, page 2, lines 5-6). A “template,” in turn, describes “what information contributions the page may contain, i.e., the number and kinds of data fields, and how those contributions will be formatted” (e.g., see Appellant’s specification, page 2, lines 3-5; and Chang, lines 7-9 of section 4.1 on page 11, and lines 2-4 of section 4.3). The “black triangle link” described in Chang and now relied upon is an “editable item,” and not editable template or formatting information stored within an electronic document, as claimed. There is a fundamental difference between editing an item and editing template or formatting information. For instance, although a user of Chang’s system may click a black triangle, as shown in the Figure 1 and 2 “Project To-Do List,” and may thereafter add or edit an “item” (see, lines 1-3 of page 4 in Chang), there is no mechanism described in Chang for editing template information or formatting information. Instead, Chang mentions that an item template “specifies the kinds of fields that make up the item, as well as formatting that will be applied to those fields,” (see, section 4.1 on page 11). These templates, however, are not editable using the “black triangle link” shown in Figures 1 and 2 (see, section 4.1, lines 9-10). Thus, while the Chang document describes templates including formatting information, there is simply no teaching or suggestion in Chang that these templates are editable to a user adding or editing an item.

In section “A-2,” the Examiner again attempts to equate the meaning of the term “item,” as described in Chang, with the claimed “template information” (see, page 13, lines 19-20 and lines 1-2 of page 14). As pointed out above, however, editing an “item” in Chang is distinctly different from editing template information.

The Examiner also mentions the Giljum patent in connection with a style template (see, page 14, lines 9-14). However, for the reasons advanced in pages 4 to 5 of the Brief, the Giljum patent fails to teach or suggest the claimed feature of “at least one of template information or formatting information stored within the electronic document,” as set forth in the context of each of independent claims 1, 12 and 20. Rather, Giljum keeps templates and formatting information separate from the folders (i.e., “electronic documents”) including the content.

In section “A-4,” at page 15 of the Answer, in response to the arguments presented on page 4 of the Brief regarding Giljum’s failure to disclose or suggest storing editable template information or formatting information within the electronic document, the Examiner asserts:

In reply to argument A-4, Examiner’s used reference “Chang”, **NOT Giljum** to reject the limitation “storing editable template or formatting information within the electronic document” as discussed in argument A-1, therefore, Appellant cannot argue the same limitation with different reference that Examiner did not use to make the rejection for the same limitation. Please see reply to argument A-1 above. (Emphasis in original.)

However, the Examiner’s argument presented in section “A-1” is absent from the final rejection. Moreover, Appellant can and have presented arguments demonstrating why the Giljum patent does not remedy the deficiencies pointed out with respect to the Chang document. Appellant respectfully requests the Examiner to provide an authority that prohibits them from arguing why each applied document fails to teach or suggest claimed subject matter.

In section “A-5,” spanning pages 15 to 16 of the Answer, the Examiner again erroneously equates the meaning of the term “item,” as used in Chang, with the claimed terms “template information or formatting information” (see, page 16, line 3). Next, the Examiner asserts that editing an item in Chang is similar to the Giljum Web Site Database, and concludes: “Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify this combination to enable the content contributor (e.g., to create a web site, the person, referred to as the content contributor, submits the content (files or images) to the web site administrator prior to publishing the content and for ensuring that the content is up to date and accurate” (emphasis added). It is not clear from this statement what “combination” the Examiner is proposing to modify (the combination of Chang and Giljum?), much less what modification is actually being suggested. In any event, even if one were to consider combining the Chang and Giljum documents, Giljum suggests a system that is quite different from Chang, as pointed out on page 4 to 5 of the Brief - a system in which templates and formatting information are stored separately from item content. In contrast, each of independent claims 1, 12 and 20 recites, “at least one of template information or formatting information stored within the electronic document.”

Sections B to D on pages 16 to 18 of the Answer also include responses to Appellant's arguments presented on pages 7 to 8 of the Brief, which pointed out distinguishing features set forth in dependent claims 34-36, 38-40 and 42-44. However, the Examiner's statements are all predicated on the unreasonable and inaccurate interpretation that an editable item is the same as editable "template information" (see, the last line of page 16, line 8 of page 17, and line 6 of page 18). Hence, these dependent claims are allowable at least for the reasons given above with respect to the independent claim, and for the additional recited subject matter defining further distinctions (see, pages 7 to 8 of the Brief).

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-3, 5-13, 15, 16, 18-21 and 23-45 is erroneous and should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 26, 2006

/John F. Guay, Reg.# 47248/  
John F. Guay

NIXON PEABODY LLP  
c/o Gunnar G. Leinberg Reg. No. 35,584  
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051  
Rochester, New York 14603-1051  
Telephone: (585) 263-1014  
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600